

John E. Selent
502-540-2315
john.selent@dinslaw.com

March 5, 2004

RECEIVED

MAR 05 2004

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Hon. Thomas M. Dorman
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Blvd.
P. O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40601

Re: In the matter of Joint Petition for Arbitration of NewSouth Communications Corp., NuVox Communications, Inc., KMC Telecom V, Inc., KMC Telecom III LLC, and Xspedius Communications, LLC on Behalf of Its Operating Subsidiaries, Xspedius Management Co. Switched Services, LLC, Xspedius Management Co. of Lexington, LLC, and Xspedius Management Co. of Louisville, LLC of an Interconnection Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended; Case No. 2004-00044 before the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky

Dear Mr. Dorman:

Enclosed is an original and 11 copies of the Joint Response and Opposition of Petitioners to BellSouth's Motion to Sever or Impose Procedural Restrictions for filing in the above-referenced case.

Please file stamp the extra copy and return to me in the self-addressed, postage prepaid envelope furnished herewith.

This Motion is of critical importance to the parties which have requested arbitration. For this reason, the parties who have filed this arbitration request an informal procedural conference by telephone, or otherwise, so that they may fully explain their position to the Public Service Commission and so that the Commission may make the most informed decision possible.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION **RECEIVED**

In the Matter of:

MAR 05 2004

NEWSOUTH COMMUNICATIONS CORP.,)
NUVOX COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,)
KMC TELECOM III LLC, AND)
XSPEDIUS COMMUNICATIONS, LLC)
on Behalf of its Operating Subsidiaries)
XSPEDIUS MANAGEMENT CO.)
SWITCHED SERVICES, LLC)
XSPEDIUS MANAGEMENT CO. OF LEXINGTON, LLC,)
and)
XSPEDIUS MANAGEMENT CO. OF LOUISVILLE, LLC)
)
Of an Interconnection Agreement with BellSouth)
Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to Section)
252(b) of the Communications Act of 1923, as)
Amended)

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Case No.
2004-00044

**JOINT RESPONSE AND OPPOSITION OF PETITIONERS
TO BELLSOUTH'S MOTION TO SEVER OR
TO IMPOSE PROCEDURAL RESTRICTIONS**

NewSouth Communications Corp. ("NewSouth"); NuVox Communications, Inc. ("NuVox"); KMC Telecom V, Inc. ("KMC V") and KMC Telecom III LLC ("KMC III") (collectively, "KMC"); and Xspedius Communications, LLC on behalf of its operating subsidiaries Xspedius Management Co. Switched Services, LLC ("Xspedius Switched"), and Xspedius Management Co. of Lexington, LLC and Xspedius Management Co. of Louisville, LLC ("Xspedius Management") (collectively, "Xspedius") (collectively, the "Joint Petitioners" or "CLEC"), by their attorneys, hereby file with the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky ("Commission") their opposition to BellSouth's Motion to Sever or

to Impose Procedural Restrictions. In support of this Joint Response, the Joint Petitioners state as follows:

1. BellSouth's Motion is without merit and should be dismissed or denied. There is nothing improper about the Joint Petition. Nor is there any basis for granting BellSouth's request to sever or adopt the procedural restrictions proposed by BellSouth. Joint Petitioners acknowledge the merit to having an efficient process and offer suggestions below to facilitate an orderly disposition. To grant BellSouth's Motion to Sever would serve no legal, procedural or other rational purpose.

2. As explained in their Joint Petition for Arbitration, the Joint Petitioners have filed a joint petition for arbitration as opposed to several individual petitions for arbitration because, in order to maximize limited resources, efficiency, and bargaining power, **they conducted consolidated negotiations with BellSouth as a group.** Joint Petition, ¶ 12. Notably, the efficiency and benefits that will result from a this multi-party arbitration will be shared by the Commission, its staff and all parties, including BellSouth. Among the efficiencies and benefits that will result from having a single arbitration in lieu of four are:

- One procedural order;
- One issues matrix to track;
- One response to any BellSouth motions;
- One set of discovery to BellSouth;
- One response to any objections by BellSouth to such discovery;
- One hearing;
- One set of briefs; and
- One Arbitration Order.

In short, because there are over 100 common issues to be decided in this arbitration proceeding,¹ separate filings and hearings would result in unwarranted expense to the parties and the Commission, as well as unnecessary duplication of efforts and delay.

3. Although it is common for arbitrations under Section 252 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (“Communications Act” or “Act”) to be between two parties, it also is not uncommon to have Section 252 arbitrations that involve multiple CLECs, such as is the case in this proceeding. Contrary to BellSouth’s suggestion, the Act appears to contemplate multiple party negotiations and arbitrations and contains no express preference for arbitrations between a single CLEC and a single ILEC.

4. Indeed, Section 252(a)(1) refers to “a requesting telecommunications carrier or carriers”, indicating that Congress contemplated that these endeavors may involve more than a single CLEC. Section 252(b)(1) states that “the carrier or any other party to the negotiation may petition a State commission to arbitrate any open issues.” In this case, the four CLECs (and their affiliated entities listed in the caption above) that were a party to the joint negotiations have petitioned the Commission for arbitration jointly. Section 252(b)(2)(A) refers to “a party” and “each of the parties” and contains no directive that the number of parties be limited to two. Section 252(b)(2)(B) also clearly contemplates that multiple parties may be involved in the same arbitration.

5. Thus, Section 252 does not express a preference as to whether petitioners should file jointly or file separately with the intent to seek consolidation. Moreover, it is clear that that a joint arbitration petition is neither expressly nor implicitly prohibited by the Act (or the Commission’s rules or orders).

¹ There are only 6 issues that are raised by just one of the CLEC. The other three CLEC simply chose not to arbitrate those issues.

6. BellSouth's quarrel with the Joint Petitioners is one that elevates form above substance without a sufficient basis to do so. BellSouth alleges that Joint Petitioners would have done better to consolidate "properly filed" separate arbitrations into a single proceeding. Motion, ¶ 1. According to BellSouth, the "proper procedure" would have involved four separate petitions, then, following the "proper course", a "proper Motion for Consideration" (presumably) requesting consolidation. *Id.*, ¶ 2. BellSouth, however, cites no legal basis mandating this process and provides no other rational foundation for imposing upon its adversaries its self-determined view of what is "proper". Thus, no real "procedural infirmities" have been alleged or suffered.

7. Indeed, Joint Petitioners respectfully submit that BellSouth's view of what is "proper" would be wasteful. For example, if BellSouth took on the burden of filing for arbitration (something it refused to do), the Commission would now likely have four motions (to consolidate) and four oppositions (by BellSouth opposing consolidation) before it instead of the single motion and single opposition it has before it now. Moreover, Joint Petitioners respectfully submit that it would be wasteful to sever and then seek to re-consolidate what already was consolidated. The Joint Petitioners had participated in consolidated joint negotiations all along. Although BellSouth had refused to bless the notion that a Joint Petition for Arbitration likely would (and did) arise from those negotiations, such blessing was never needed.²

8. Despite BellSouth's attempts to create confusion and concern, the plain and simple fact is that a proceeding with one petition, one response, one set of procedural orders, one set of discovery, one set of briefs, one hearing and one decision will result in economies and efficiencies that will be realized by the Commission and all parties. The Joint Petition contains

² In their Joint Petition, Joint Petitioners did not imply that BellSouth had either agreed to a Joint Petition or waived its right to object. Thus, BellSouth's assertion in this regard, *see* Motion, ¶ 4, appears to be a case of BellSouth creating a concern where none exists.

97 issues common to all parties. With respect to these 97 issues, CLECs have jointly submitted a position statement (see Joint Petition and Joint Issues Matrix). Obviously, it will be more efficient to decide these issues once, as opposed to four times. Of the remaining 10 issues, there are 4 that are common to multiple CLECs and 6 that are common only to one CLEC and BellSouth.³ What distinguishes these 10 issues from the other 97 is that one or more of the Joint Petitioners opted not to arbitrate these 10 issues. Nevertheless, where more than one CLEC is arbitrating the issue (whether it be two or three CLECs), those CLECs have jointly adopted a position statement. In short, there is a single CLEC position for each and every issue.⁴

9. BellSouth's primary concern appears to be that Joint Petitioners have not promised that *all* of the efficiencies of one proceeding (instead of four) will be delivered with respect to the filing of testimony by Joint Petitioners⁵ and the cross-examination of BellSouth's witnesses by Joint Petitioners. BellSouth's concern is misplaced. First, Joint Petitioners easily can agree that they will have only one attorney representing Joint Petitioners cross-examine a BellSouth witness on any given issue, or sub-issue, as the case may be. *See* Motion, ¶¶ 11-12.

10. With respect to testimony filed on behalf of each of the Joint Petitioners, BellSouth appears to presume that the Joint Petitioners should become one company and should file as a single entity. Motion, ¶ 13. The Joint Petitioners, however, are in fact not a single

³ Although there can be no guaranty, Joint Petitioners believe that, given the current course of ongoing discussions with BellSouth, it is likely that as many as 8 of these 10 issues will settle before hearing.

⁴ Joint Petitioners note that approximately 10 issues have been resolved by the parties since the Joint Petition was filed and that the Joint Petitioners actively are working with BellSouth to negotiate resolutions to additional issues. A revised Joint Issues Matrix will be filed to reflect and inform the Commission of those issues that it no longer needs to arbitrate.

⁵ While, by its very nature, a proceeding involving four petitioners almost certainly will be more efficient than four separate ones, by virtue of its inclusion of multiple independent entities, a proceeding involving four petitioners almost certainly will be more complex than a proceeding involving only one. However, because this proceeding is likely to be modestly more complicated than a proceeding involving a single petitioner and a single respondent does not suggest that it would be prudent to replace it with four separate proceedings that will require duplication of efforts in all respects.

entity. Although two of the four CLECs – NewSouth and NuVox – recently announced an agreement to merge, it remains likely that there will be at least three independent CLECs as petitioners at the time this proceeding reaches hearing.

11. BellSouth’s suggestion that one CLEC party should have filed and the others should simply wait to adopt the agreement that results from this arbitration is again based solely on what BellSouth views is proper without any legal foundation or other support. Motion, ¶ 13. Moreover, it is disingenuous. Unless each of the Joint Petitioners filed for arbitration, each faced the prospect of being ejected from its current interconnection agreement into the standard BellSouth interconnection agreement.

12. As BellSouth is well aware, each of the Joint Petitioners have roughly 100 points of disagreement with BellSouth’s standard interconnection agreement, not to mention the dozens (if not hundreds) of issues raised with respect to the BellSouth standard agreement that were resolved through active negotiations. In addition, BellSouth has been and remains well aware that each of the Joint Petitioners will have separate and different (there are four versions of Attachment 3) interconnection agreements at the far end of this proceeding. Thus, the Commission must rebuff BellSouth’s attempt to forge a single entity where there are four, each with their own legal rights and obligations.

13. All this is not to say that the Joint Petitioners are not amenable to procedures that will streamline this proceeding. As stated in the Joint Petition, “[n]o CLEC party takes a position adverse to the position taken by the other CLEC.” As indicated on the Joint Issues Matrix, Joint Petitioners have offered a single “CLEC Position” for each and every issue. Joint Petitioners also stated in the Joint Petition that they intended to use, to the fullest extent possible, a “team” witness approach. In subsequent discussions with BellSouth on this issue, Joint

Petitioners fleshed out their “team” proposal which would entail the use of panels containing witnesses from each CLEC that joined in raising an issue being open to cross-examination by BellSouth (BellSouth could choose whether to address the panel or individual witnesses) on an issue-by-issue basis.

14. BellSouth, however, expressed a preference against multi-party panels and in favor of crossing CLEC witnesses, one CLEC at a time. That alternative approach would be acceptable to CLECs. In that approach, the use of panels would be limited to instances where a CLEC had multiple witnesses to cover the various subparts or technical and policy related concerns raised with respect to an issue. That approach, however, did not satisfy BellSouth.

15. To address BellSouth’s concerns regarding having to read four separate sets of substantially similar, harmonious, complementary and often redundant testimony, Joint Petitioners also informed BellSouth that they are willing to file consolidated and integrated Joint Testimony encompassing all testimony on all issues. Such Joint Testimony would list all CLEC witnesses on the cover (likely 2-3 per CLEC) and inside would set out by company which witnesses were sponsoring what. Some answers would be sponsored by a witness from all companies, some by fewer than all. The Joint Testimony at its beginning would include a section introducing by company each witness, with appropriate biographical information and qualifications, and a paragraph listing the answers he or she sponsors. To facilitate such identification, answers to questions would be numbered. To make it easy for the Commission, staff and all parties to follow, CLECs would include at the end of each numbered answer an indication of which company witnesses are sponsoring the answer (*e.g.*, [Sponsored by: M. Johnson (KMC), J. Jennings (NewSouth), H. Russell (NuVox), J. Falvey (Xspedius)]). This

proposal will create a composite document that will be easy to read and track and that will alleviate the need for paper shuffling and comparison of four sets of entirely separate testimony.

16. BellSouth also rejected this proposal and continues to insist that each petitioner should be stripped of its right to present evidence in support of the Joint Petition. Each of the Joint Petitioners has declined to voluntarily agree to give up its right to present company-specific testimony in support of the Joint Petition. As stated above, where they can speak with one voice they will do so by having multiple witnesses sponsor the same testimony. However, each CLEC is an independent company with different circumstances and experiences to draw upon in support of the common positions adopted by the Joint Petitioners. Joint Petitioners have proposed an eminently reasonable, accommodating, streamlined and orderly way of presenting that testimony and should be afforded their right to present evidence in support of their Joint Petition.

17. Finally, Joint Petitioners note that BellSouth now appears to be amenable or at least expresses no opposition to a temporary waiver of the 9-month statutory deadline for deciding this proceeding. In prior discussions between the parties, BellSouth refused to agree to a proposed regional schedule that would have required such a waiver. Joint Petitioners support a waiver of the 9 month statutory deadline in this case, as neither the Commission nor the parties have much to benefit from deciding the numerous and complex issues raised in a rushed manner. In this regard, Joint Petitioners propose that a temporary waiver of the 9-month deadline be granted and suggest that the parties consult with Commission Staff and attempt to agree on an appropriate duration of the temporary waiver (e.g., 6 months).

WHEREFORE, the Joint Petitioners respectfully request that the Commission dismiss or deny BellSouth's Motion to Sever or to Impose Procedural Restrictions, and grant any other relief as the Commission may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



John E. Selent
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1400 PNC Plaza
500 W. Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202
Tel.: (502) 540-2300
Fax: (502) 585-2207
E-mail: john.selent@dinslaw.com

John J. Heitmann
Enrico C. Soriano
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel.: (202) 955-9600
Fax: (202) 955-9792
E-mail: jheitmann@kelleydrye.com

Counsel to the Joint Petitioners

Dated: March 4, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the foregoing was served by mailing a copy of the same by First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, to the following, this 5th day of March 2004.


J. Phillip Carver
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
1155 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Jake E. Jennings
Senior Vice President
NewSouth Communications Corp.
NewSouth Center
Two North Main Street
Greenville, SC 29601

Dorothy J. Chambers
General Counsel/Kentucky
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
601 W. Chestnut Street, Room 410
P.O. Box 32410
Louisville, KY 40232
BellSouthKY.CaseFilings@BellSouth.com

Marva Brown Johnson
Senior Regulatory Policy Advisor
KMC Telecom V, Inc.
1755 North Brown Road
Lawrenceville, GA 30043

Bo Russell
Regional Vice President
NuVox Communications, Inc.
301 North Main Street
Suite 5000
Greenville, SC 29601



Counsel to the Joint Petitioners